



EUROPEAN MEDICINES AGENCY
SCIENCE MEDICINES HEALTH

EMA/HMPC/75262/2026
EMA/HMPC/M/H/0282
Committee on Herbal Medicinal Products (HMPC)

Opinion of the HMPC on a European Union herbal monograph on *Glycyrrhiza glabra* L.; *Glycyrrhiza inflata* Bat.; *Glycyrrhiza uralensis* Fisch., radix

Opinion

The HMPC, in accordance with Article 16h(3) of Directive 2001/83/EC and as set out in the appended assessment report, establishes, by majority of 25 out of 26 votes a revised European Union herbal monograph on *Glycyrrhiza glabra* L.; *Glycyrrhiza inflata* Bat.; *Glycyrrhiza uralensis* Fisch., radix which is set out in Annex I.

The divergent position is appended to this opinion.

The Norwegian HMPC member agrees with the above-mentioned recommendation of the HMPC.

The opinion is forwarded to Member States and Norway, together with its Annex I and appendices.

The revised European Union herbal monograph and assessment report will be published on the European Medicines Agency website. They replace those adopted on 22 May 2012.

Amsterdam, 4 March 2026.



Annex I: European Union herbal monograph (EMA/HMPC/108399/2024)

Appendix I: Assessment report (EMA/HMPC/108395/2024)

Appendix II: Divergent position

The member of the HMPC mentioned below did not agree with the HMPC's opinion for the following reason:

'Reading the reviewed monograph on *Liquiritiae radix* and its assessment report I can see the essential difference between the second indication in the Monograph: „Traditional herbal medicinal product used as an expectorant in cough associated with cold” and in the Table 1 of the Assessment report where are presented also products, currently used in the EU countries, as expectorants in cough.

However, in the assessment report Primary pharmacodynamics are presented Anti-inflammatory activity (important in gastric and duodenal inflammatory states) Gastro-intestinal activities (correct) but Antitussive effects, what is opposite to the commonly known expectorant activity of the root preparations activity and also to the traditional use.

Antitussive affects, observed in the conditions of the test, with exposure of Airways mucosa to irritant and counter-irritants aerosols is not relevant to the oral use of liquorice products, referred in the report. The tests should have been referred rather as secondary pharmacology.

This is the reason why I refrained in acceptance of the package.'

Dymowski Wojciech, HMPC member from Poland.

Amsterdam, 4 March 2026.